DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 743 HE 014 827

AUTHOR Slawski, Carl
TITLE A General Policy Systems Approach to Organizational Governance.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Society for General Systems Research (Washington, DC, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Case Studies; College Administration; College Planning; Decision Making; Educational Objectives; *Governance; Higher Education; *Holistic Approach; Models; Needs Assessment; *Organizational Theories; Policy Formation; Problem Solving; Program Evaluation; *Retrenchment; *Systems Approach
IDENTIFIERS General Policy Systems Theory; Program Objectives

ABSTRACT

A General Policy Systems Theory is outlined and its application at a university in regard to governance in the face of retrenchment is described. The way that this model of nonrigorous but holistic research supports the Purpose, Target, Results (PTR) strategy and is in turn more useful than either operations research/management or science/systems analysis is addressed. Additionally, Ouchi's Theory Z is elaborated in a general systems theory model. Case material shows how the approach can be applied to problems of consultation between the president and the managerial executive and operating or contact level professionals. The following eight tasks important to problem-solving are identified: realize the problem in the situation, clarify goals, describe trends, analyze conditioning factors, project future development, invent and consider policy alternatives, implement new policies, and conduct ongoing evaluation research. These steps, which comprise the policy systems approach represent a more complete version of PTR, but without the targets. The six major components of Theory Z are as follows: long-range planning, collective decision making, a more equalitarian workplace, reciprocal employer-employee loyalty, collective responsibility, and long-range productivity and company effectiveness. The theory involves a holistic concern for the company and its employees as whole human beings and it attempts to promote holistic relationships among employees at all levels of the bureaucracy. The case study on retrenchment is diagramed in terms of the dynamics. Ways to encourage collective cooperation in university governance are also discussed. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

In Proceedings of the Society for General Systems Research, Washington, D.C., 1982.

ED217743

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carl Slawski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A GENERAL POLICY SYSTEMS APPROACH TO ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

by CARL SLAWSKI

Sociology Department
California State University
Long Beach, CA 90840

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Abstract

The Problem is to demonstrate the practicality of an open systems model for public and organizational policy development and decision-making, especially as exemplified and applied to institutions of higher education.

It is expected that the proposed methodological approach will promote a better understanding of problem solving and mechanisms of organizational change, as well as more informed decision-making, because of its comprehensiveness and well specified process orientation. Such decisions will be more realistic, humanistic, and organizationally effective because they will strike a more favorable balance between overquantification and seat-of-the-pants data gathering.

Demonstration of the utility of the approach will make it easier not just for researchers but mainly for managerial decision-makers to employ concepts of General Systems Theory on a daily basis. This in turn will lead to further advances in the theory and methods per se, since the greatest advances in theory and methods are nearly always made in the process of solving practical (here social and organizational) problems.

With suitable adaptations, the approach is applicable to intraorganizational relations in any large-scale/formal/complex organization, particularly to the processes of consultation, collective decision-making, long-range planning, and discretion in presidential decision-making.

It will be shown how this general policy systems model of non-rigorous, but holistic research, supports the PTR (Purpose, Target, Results) strategy, and is in turn more useful than either OR/MS/SA (Operations Research/Management Science/Systems Analysis) per se, in this context. Along the way, Ouchi's Theory Z will be elaborated in a GST model.

Case material shows how the approach can be applied to problems of consultation between the president or his/her managerial executive and operating or contact level professionals. Or in general, how does GST facilitate governance or management practices? And how can Theory Z be used in terms of a GST model.

Wider application of this approach by practitioners, OD consultants, and administrators combined with follow-up studies of its effectiveness in practice are needed for verification.

A GENERAL POLICY SYSTEMS APPROACH TO ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

A very common management problem in the present period of staff cutbacks and budget cutting in general is how these retrenchment decisions can be fairly made without at the same time decreasing the quality of the product or service rendered. The seat-of-the-pants approach has rarely had long term success in any complex organization. What is called for is a broadly based model with as great a number of more valuable relevant variables accounted for as possible. The widely used and more valuable techniques of OR/MS/SA, Operations Research/Management Science/Systems Analsis have also been criticized (by Nadler, 1980) for attempting to achieve these desirable goals of efficiency and parsimony by scientism, analysis, modeling, quantification and reductionism, in the attempts of proponents to promote better problem-solving and policy setting. The research approach per se may itself be the biggest stumbling block to finding the good solutions society needs. This notion is supported by some critics of the Systems Research Movement (contained in Cavallo, ed., July 1979).

Studies of actual cases of public planning (by Nadler) suggest that a more practical approach to planning might well be the PTR or Purpose-Target-Results Approach (of Nadler). The present paper will describe this approach in terms of two General Systems Theory types of model in

> HE 014 827

order to put the PTR approach in context as well as to show its potential value for an applied GST approach which I will call GPST, a General Policy Systems Theory. Application and illustrations will be taken from a case of university governance in the face of retrenchment. But the possibility will also be introduced of incorporating still another approach, that of theory Z (Ouchi, 1981) within the context of the GPST. This in turn should broaden our scope and depth of integration of alternate but complementary approaches to improving the governing process in the university.

The simplest way to begin is to refer to the outlines of a basic flow diagram in the GST tradition. The diagrams in the paper will be divided into six basic columns, starting with labels at the bottom of each diagram indicating the category of variables to be contained in the column above. The leftmost column is labeled the "viewpoint in focus," such that the perspective or type of observer of the situation will be listed in that column. That lower lefthand box also indicates that the conceptual components of each column are listed to the right in logical sequence, as follows. Column two will contain the variables dealing with "assessment" of the situation per se. Column three will list "purposes" of the planning enterprise. Column four will list "Procedure or strategies for Implementation" of the plan. Column five will list "probable targets achieved" by implementation of the plan. And Column six will list the "Results" from a "global or functional" point of view, considering the enterprise or organization or society as a whole. In particular, columns three, five and six correspond to the key dimensions of the PTR approach. Column two (assessment) is a necessary prerequisite to a statement of purpose. Column four is a necessary specification of means of achievement of the targets.

Diagram I

Certain other background considerations can be highlighted here in order to see the similarities and alternate emphases on planning from the point of view of the Policy Sciences approach, exemplified in the work of Harold Laswell and many others. McDougal and Lasswell (1959, p. 11-12) in a landmark article outline five intellectual tasks pertinent to the solution of any legal problem. It is a small step from reading and listening to Lasswell to add three other tasks to complete his outline of the policy sciences approach. Diagram I, the bottom half, and top row, lists these eight tasks by number. The second column is the starting point. It contains #1: Realize the problems in the situation or context. Column three, #2: Clarify goal(s) of the system or enterprise. Column six, #3: Describe the trends. Column two again, #4: Analyze conditioning factors of the case. Column six, #5: Project future developments based upon past trends. Back to column three, #6: Invent and consider policy alternatives. Column four, #7: Implement new policies. Column two, at the top, #8: Perform ongoing evaluation research. The order of steps spelled out here is a logical and practical one that is somewhat more detailed than that indicated by the three steps of PTR. Thus it represents a more complete version of PTR, but without the T(Targets). This likely occurs because targets were considered only a specification of the goals themselves, or the global purposes. And use of the method for immediate practical, smaller scale goals was not yet an issue for Lasswell at the early (1959) stage of development of the Policy Sciences approach. The overlap and relation of Policy Sciences to PTR to GST is in itself a subject for a separate paper. It is introduced here as already synthesized in order to broaden our scope and elaborate the particulars of our case of public policy with greater clarity. Notice that diagram I, in the interests of conserving space, includes in the wide third row a classification of components of Theory Z, to be described a bit later, by way of possible solution to the concrete, problematic case to be introduced. With this as a background it is time to lay out the illustrative problematic case of organizational governance.

The issue at a particular university campus of relationships between faculty and administration (especially as embodied in the president) has spanned at least fifteen years and three presidents, the last one being in office for the previous eleven years. The beginning of his term of office came at a time of turmoil and conflict related to the Viet Nam war, the student and civil rights movements and peak enrollments, especially in the social sciences, in 1970. Now after eleven years of historical change in a time of more conservative students, lawmakers stingy with educational funding, a greatly declined enrollment in most disciplines (though not overall, except notably in engineering, business and computer sciences) plus anticipation in the state university in question of collective bargaining becoming operable in the near future, it appears that some tenured faculty are almost on the verge of layoff. The skirmishes continue between the academic senate and a president whom they consider authoritarian and whom they say fails to seriously consult with them to resolve policy differences. He is seen to listen, sometimes only through his admin-

7/81
Slawski

DIAGRAM I

GPST + Theory Z

	8. Ongoing Evaluation Research	←			3. Describe trends
Theory Z		I. Long-range Planning A. Wholistic Concern B. Wholistic Relationships C. State Objectives: 1) Corporate 2) Individual	II. Collective Decision-Making A. Non-Specialized Career Path B. Implicit Control Mechanisms C. Incentives to Implement Philosophy plus Structures D. Implement at the First Level	III. A More Egalitarian Workplace IV. Reciprocal Employer-Employee Loyalty A. Stability V. Collective Responsibility	VI. Long-range Productivity and Company Effectiveness
Policy Sciences Approach	1. Realize the Problem in the Situation	2. Clarify goal(s)			
	4. Analyze Conditioning Factors	6. Invent and Consider Policy Alternatives	7. Implement New Policies		5. Project Future Developments
viewpoint in focus; / conceptual component:	Assessment →	P=PURPOSE(S) →	Procedures/Strategies for Implementation →	T= (probable) TARGET(S) (achieved) →	R= Global/Functional RESULTS

istrative designees, and then to turn around and make decisions contrary to the wishes of the majority of the faculty, mainly in the interests of a business economy and maintenance of top-down control. New legislative pressures came to bear and the conflict came to a head in the Fall of 1980 over the issue of division of TSA's, Teaching Service Areas, in order to undermine the tenure system. The president claimed this was in the interests of quality of our educational program. The threat to faculty is grave and led in the spring to a series of letters from both sides in newspapers on campus, in the local city newspapers, and in the Chronicle of Higher Education. There was a vote (in May) of no confidence in the president by a large majority of voting faculty, but the faculty have no legal power to oust the president or to change the threatening policies he had recently proposed and intended to implement on short notice.

The president's pacifying move has been to delay implementation of his new division of the teaching service areas four more months (until December) in order to allow further consultation. Some say it is only a show of open-mindedness, to make it appear that he has fulfilled the legal requirements for consultation. At this writing (in October) no detailed rationale for the changes has been forthcoming.

Diagram II

Diagram II uses the same six column scheme with the same concepts applying to the six columns as in Diagram I. The bottom row indicates short titles of the columns in the PTR scheme. The second row from the bottom is labeled (at the left) "general situation." The P (Purpose) column in that row indicates the faculty accepted ground rules in the situation of presidential consultation described above. The faculty see themselves as worker/professionals retaining a written code of ethics, belief in a bill of rights (such as the one for teachers stated by the NEA: 1972), legal protection of tenure, and an implied (but not yet a written) contract stating their duties. The fourth or Procedures column reminds us of the existing adversarial pattern between faculty and administration at this institution, particularly on this campus. The pattern could be said to be a consequence in part of a cynical management strategy. This could be the administrator's way of pragmatically adapting to an impossibly complex, strained and embattled political situation at the state, system and campus levels. But this kind of administrative cynicism is often associated with the garbage can theory (March & Olsen: 1979) of decision making in higher education circles. This means that issues are backlogged, decisions pile up due to the overwork load suffered by most academics, resulting in decisions being made serially, by vote without enough resources or consideration devoted to achieving informed consensus on the really important issues. All decisions tend to simply become equalized with the less important or even the trivial issues.

The ultimate consequence is governance by fiat from above, or something closely akin to that. The R (Results) column shows this writer's view that there exists an emphasis on the status quo, departmentalization and apathy associated with an oligarchical rule of old-boyism as well as a residual of deadwood faculty, or at least apathetic faculty. Why not become deadwood or apathetic when the system is not responsive to consultation or effective faculty input into the governance system? This in turn has in all likelihood led to further enrollment declines as some of the faculty have contented themselves with putting minimal effort into their teaching jobs. And there is general demoralization, especially among the faculty prevented from advancement or promotion by tightfisted and often unreasonable and unsupported negative decisions about their careers. These descriptive terms are an attempt to outline the many problems in a way that sees as many points of view as possible, though in the long run it is likely slanted in the direction of progressive faculty perceptions.

In the top half of Diagram II, we see a more concrete and immediate view of the case at hand. Another observer might put a quite different set of concepts in these boxes, and multiple situation analysis operating independently should be encouraged in order to achieve greater validity in the final policy theory after all views have finally been reconciled. However, to illustrate the procedure, the author's analysis will be put forward in the one-shot case study mode of research design. The third row is labeled "proximate issue" and is divided into four time periods, labeled in order: t1, t2, t3, and t4, indicating something about the chronological order of priority of events up to the date of this writing.

In the time 2 row, second or assessment column, we indicate the most obvious fact, that of declining student enrollment due to demographic shifts. This was and still is in many cases accompanied by departmental inertia or inaction in the face of this serious threat to faculty jobs. In the fourth or procedures column we indicate the front of consultation put forward by the president's representatives or designees. This is followed in the T or Target column (column 5) by the president's initiative to divide TSA's (Teaching

7/81
Slawski

Diagram II

GPST : ACTUAL CASE
(Imposition + Resistance)

proximate issue	t_1	student decline departmental inertia		A front of consultation	TSA division	Presidential censure
	t_2				Micro-specialization Easy Pruning/Cutbacks	
	t_3	TSA division				Contract Alteration. High Layoff threat. Public Dissention. Litigousness, Grievances.
	t_4			Faculty Gamesmanship		Enrollment Scramble. Competitiveness. Time Serving. Moonlighting. Lose better, newer faculty. Centralization later.
General Situation			Faculty Ground-rules: Worker/Professional. Code of Ethics. Bill of Rights. Tenure Protection. Implied Contract	Adversarial Pattern vs. Cynical Management Strategy, Using Garbage Can Theory.		Status Quo: Departmentalism Apathy Oligarchy Old-boyism Deadwood Enrollment Decline Demoralization
viewpoint in focus; conceptual component:		Assessment →	P=PURPOSE(S) →	Procedures/Strategies for Implementation →	T= (probable) TARGET(S) (achieved) →	R= Global/Functional RESULTS

Service Areas) into narrow subspecialties. Since layoffs will be determined by TSA, this became an immediate alarm signal and led to the vote (in May) of a majority of the faculty to censure the president, indicated in the last column (#6 of Diagram II).

In the time 2 row is indicated the Target (in Column #5) of the action of imposing specialized designations, that of easy pruning and cutbacks by the president who has the final authority in such matters.

In the time 3 row the TSA division is in the second or assessment column as the issue in focus under the circumstances. This led to the short-circuited results in the last or R column of contract alteration immediately before a collective bargaining election, as well as a high threat of layoff, public dissension, litigous actions and mass grievances (about 300 at once), both collective and individual, encouraged by the two faculty unions vying for the position of collective bargaining agent.

In the time 4 row, in the fourth or procedures column, we see the expected faculty gamesmanship. What else could one expect, since they are told they have academic freedom yet are treated as serfs. Some of the specific results include the continuing scramble for enrollment, general competitiveness among faculty, a time serving attitude among faculty (to match the long existing time serving attitude of most students at the urban commuter campus). A high percentage of faculty must moonlight to even make ends meet financially. The better and newer faculty leave either to escape the politics or because of cutbacks in the number of faculty positions. Common experience has also shown that after collective bargaining elections, most campuses have experienced even tighter controls at the level of the central administration or system of campuses. This could well happen here. The general result again is likely to be even further demoralization.

Before returning to our general solution in terms of Theory Z, it would be useful to state a catch-all, brainstorming list assessing the problems, followed immediately afterwards by a list of contrasting alternatives. Space does not permit a rationalization of all these observations and suggested alternatives. They are presented as impressions for the stimulation or provocation of the reader's own suggested solutions, perhaps by means of his/her own brainstorming discussions. But that is the open-ended nature of policy research as well as the present model of GPST.

On the negative side, decrees from the central administration in recent years have indicated changes in working conditions and terms of the faculty's implied hiring contract. This has nullified the effect of the probationary years each faculty member has put in struggling for the acquisition of tenure. It allows quotas on tenured positions now, a concept which was overturned in the courts a few years ago. It belies any clearly stated philosophy of education, let alone philosophy of management. It keeps all faculty on a job survival basis with its accompanying insecurity, stress, tension, and demoralization. It therefore seriously decreases institutional loyalty or concern for institutional survival as a whole. It strongly promotes over-specialization, encourages the best young professors to seek other jobs. It discourages broad scholarship and multidisciplinary teaching. It favors the currently fashionable job market areas of specialization. It changes one's job description without researching the long-term consequences for the institution, and it does so without serious or adequate consultation of the full-time employees, or faculty in this case. It does not deal with the problem of portability of tenure from one Teaching Service Area or Certified Teaching Specialty to another. It fails to deal with the problem of incompetent teachers or administrators, or deadwood as they are commonly known. It uses ill-considered and outdated management strategies, the old theory X or the American hierarchical system. It employs a tall bureaucracy to channel orders. All this comes on the threshold of a collective bargaining election. It uses a garbage can model of decision making. It will likely promote intradepartmental conflict when layoffs are impending. It has promoted if not academic gamesmanship, at least consciousness raising about the true motivation of the present university administration.

On the positive side, it would be possible to deal with shifting enrollment patterns by a much more flexible system of exchanging faculty members across departments. There could be computer matching of teachers to courses needed. Job hiring descriptions could be checked for breadth and potential adaptability to future needs of more than one narrow specialty in the light of whole departmental or program needs. Tenure could even be given byschool and not department alone, thus facilitating further breadth of perspective among the faculty.

A list of faculty suggestions could be solicited on the quality of education problem (claimed by the campus president to be the main issue). If quality is the issue one should be able to specify a precise

mechanism or sequence of social and structural variables influencing the situation in such a way as to carefully describe the process by which dividing up teaching service areas would affect the quality of education students receive. Until these processes are made very specific, we have only empty rhetoric and genuflections in the direction of the idols of academia, not serious long range planning.

If the president designates a representative to act on his behalf, that single person should be clearly and unambiguously designated, rather than permitting the guessing game of "Who's in charge?" across three or four levels of committees and hierarchy. This should be done at the outset of each significant case of presidential action in need of consultation.

If shifting enrollment patterns are the issue, it would be desirable to give higher policy and financial priority to multi and cross disciplinary, and broad, problem centered teaching areas, such as energy/environment, peace and conflict, technological and social change, scientific breakthroughs, and the like.

Faculty could be encouraged to seek new careers, or make mid-career transitions, through monetary incentives, job or career-change insurance, low interest loans, extended leaves without pay to retrain for new positions or specialties, or mandatory paid Sabbaticals of at least one semester every seven years. Faculty development and retraining could be encouraged by paid participation in workshops or Personalized System of Instruction type courses on methods or content of teaching or pedagogy, or on job switching, early or semi-retirement, or full retirement (perhaps with pay contingent on a specified minimum of participation). For this, for every 500 faculty members, there ought to be two or three full-time equivalent faculty development counselors with deep and extensive training in aiding college faculty. There could be released time given on a half time per semester basis to teacher-consultants selected for their constructive approach and success in teaching by the faculty

The workload of faculty could be reduced to increase quality by requiring fewer courses or sections to be taught, fewer new preparations for the few faculty who often teach new courses. The amount of superficial paperwork required for Retention and Advancement, post-tenure review and the like could be significantly reduced. Further, the criteria for promotion and supporting measures and compensation for teaching outside one's department could be given more weight than for teaching the same four or five courses for a lifetime.

It would assist greatly to eliminate the overemphasis on mean scores and invalid quantitative weighting of items on teacher evaluation instruments to the exclusion of any statistical controls for intervening variables.

Ample released time and funds for course improvement could be allotted, including for new course development or the implementation of a self improvement contract (along the lines of Management by Objectives).

Regular, at least monthly open meetings of one to two hours for broad discussions with faculty could be held by the president, the academic vice president and the deans, focusing on broad educational policies and practices.

Much more could be done to promote collegial fraternity that would overflow into friendships across many departments.

There could be promotion with released time, research grants, etc., of studies of the mission and goals of departments and programs, faculty morale, and the HEMI (Higher Education Management Institute) survey feedback approach with adequately sponsored retreats for departments and programs, or whole schools.

Finally, as we shall see, Theory Z management techniques could be promoted in the way described in Ouchi's book on Theory Z. Culbert in The Organization Trap (chap. 19, pp. 132 ff.) also suggests how to affect the organization life of others in several prescriptions. Culbert's main points are that top-down change doesn't make it. And a strategy needs to be developed with a statesmanlike approach.

Theory Z

Armed with these contrasting thoughts, let us look back at the top half of Diagram I, for a brief exposition of the six main components of Theory Z, with subpoints as appropriate. There is no built-in assessment component so we look just at column 3 for Purposes. We see that Theory Z has as its first principle (I) long-range planning. This is in contrast to the American tradition of annual (i.e., short-term) production goals and helps explain why for example the Japanese auto industry has adapted to the needs of American consumers long before the American car-makers did. But surely there are lessons to be learned by academic administrators from this theory in a time of need for rapid adaptation to a changing student marketplace.

Under long range planning, or associated with it, Theory Z utilizes A) a whol-

istic concern for the company and all its employees as whole human beings, not merely as bureaucratic functionaries. It attempts to promote B) Wholistic Relationships among employees at all levels of the bureaucracy, not by artificial get-togethers but by providing support and resources such that the employees spontaneously seek one another out even off the job. The third element under long range planning is C) the need to State Objectives both for the corporation and for the individual employee (perhaps along the lines of MBO, Management by Objectives).

Looking into the fourth or Procedures column of Diagram I we see the second main component (II) of theory Z in its emphasis on Collective Design Making. This is accomplished in corporate industry in Japan. But contrary to the myths of faculty self governance, it is seldom achieved in practice in American colleges and universities. It is less likely to happen in large, hierarchical public systems which are controlled by trustees who are captains of industry, and state legislatures which are out to cut taxes, but whose members know little of the inner workings of higher education systems. This is to say nothing of the mentality of top governance officials who don't know the business or college presidents who have never worked as teaching faculty members themselves, or who have taught so many years in the past as to have little effect on their understanding of present-day faculty needs. Consultation with employees/faculty ought indeed to be at a premium, especially on far-reaching decisions.

Four main guidelines aid the emphasis on Collective Decision Making. These are A) Non-specialized Career Paths. Employees learn the whole range of jobs in the company so that they understand firsthand the inner workings of the system and need not be so overspecialized that they wear assembly-line blinders and become alienated from their work This breadth naturally increases job satisfaction, efficiency, and long term loyalty. The present case under investigation violates this guideline as severely as it is possible to do. It would make a lot of common sense to encourage faculty, with significant incentives, to retrain or to prepare to teach courses in new areas currently in greater demand, even outside their home departments. They could also be encouraged to rotate into and out of administrative posts periodically throughout their careers in order to familiarize themselves with the complete workings of the administrative process. And top administrators ought to be expected to teach courses regularly or periodically and probably ought not to remain career administrators in order not to lose their sense of laboring in the trenches felt by those teaching masses of undergraduate, let alone lower division courses in a mass system of public education. It is an experience difficult to appreciate by the uninitiated. The division of teaching service areas into narrow specialties for layoff purposes is a narrowing, alienating experience for most faculty, destroying any sense of wholistic concern or collective decision making still remaining for them in such a demoralizing, self-isolating, bureaucratic system. This guideline of non-specialized career paths, indicated by Theory Z, is turned on its head in the present problematic case.

The second adjunct to Collective Decision Making is B) Implicit Control Mechanisms. There is little need under this guideline to have minute bureaucratic rules for every occasion and every exception because everyone knows what procedures work well through experience in many positions within the firm. Thus each member is able to take a corporation-wide point of view and cooperate with everyone else in achieving their shared goals without threat of external negative sanctions. This seldom happens in academia.

On the contrary, in addition, C) positive Incentives and structures of operation are provided to encourage implementation of the company philosophy. The current academic climate not only provides little incentive, it threatens loss of job and career while cutting back on necessary supplies and support services. Research time and funding are for the privileged elite. Philosophies of teaching are amorphous or non-existent. The incentives are such that high student ratings take precedence over solid learning.

The fourth point under collective decision making is D) Implement at the First Level. Top down orders will not be accepted by most workers, but the administrative leaders must provide the rationale in a convincing way together with incentives to the largest group of employees, those at the bottom of the company hierarchy. Government of a university by a far distant legislature, a remote board of trustees or an inaccessible president gives multi-campus university systems the tallest bureaucracies imaginable and the least likelihood of cooperation with the invisible administrative hand in the sky.

The third main point of Theory Z (under the fifth or Targets column of Diagram I) is III) A More Equalitarian Workplace. This does not mean a glad hand and a patronizing ear followed by a decision from on high as so often happens in the American firm, including academia. Rather it calls for skill on the part of managers in understanding the roles of co-workers,

superiors, subordinates and peers, as well as distributed centers of power. The state of the public academy is that of a very tall, impersonal and unwieldy bureaucracy in contrast again to the myth of academic freedom and mutual respect for colleagues' roles in the pursuit and advancement of knowledge.

Remaining in the fifth (or Targets) column, we see the harmonizing aim of IV) Reciprocal Employer-Employee Loyalty, which in turn provides stability for the corporation and its members. What incentive is there for loyalty if half of those eligible for promotion don't bother to apply and half of those who apply are turned down with demeaning comments in order to economize and make of the house of learning an assembly line factory turning out student body counts. Those at the top are the only ones likely to remain loyal under the circumstances and even their positions will not be very stable due to discontent in the ranks.

Remaining under the Targets column is V) Collective Responsibility. The suggestion box is filled with ideas on efficiency by first line workers in after-work brainstorming sessions in Japanese plants. While the suggestions of the American college professor are debated to death or ignored completely unless they happen to achieve rare universal consensus by some political stratagem How can the ordinary professor accept responsibility when he is expected to publish, teach four courses per semester, and serve on mostly powerless committees to the tune of 60-80 hours per week. Responsibility will be willingly accepted by those who have some chance of influencing procedures, practices or outcomes, not by those so demoralized, isolated or overburdened that they can only muster the energy to do their necessary work in a minimally acceptable manner. If decisions are handed down from above, in violation of previously agreed upon procedures and with little but consultation through memoranda filtering down through three or four levels of bureaucracy, how can those at the bottom, the college professors, feel other than resentment? Collective responsibility is a noble ideal but can never be achieved without shared power, skilled and egalitarian managers and top executives who are able to govern with inspirational and insightful leadership qualities. Constant reference by the president to his legal right to make decisions, in ignorance of the need for collective agreement, will only halt the wheels of progress and show the ineptitude of the top executive.

The way to reverse the undesirable trends is not merely for administrators to spend more time pacifying their underlings, but to help the professors to see the need for the revolutionary new structure (such as TSA division) that is about to be imposed. If they can be convinced, they will comply and even assist in the implementation. But if it is seen as a gross movement to obtain more direct power over the career of all professors and to remake the university into a marketplace for training businesspeople and computer experts, then it is likely that professors will mount a counterrevolution. In the present case, this has begun to happen, though only time will tell whether responsibility will be delegated collectively or retained monolithically by the president of the campus. One could hope for a retraction of the imposed TSA divisions, but the vibrations have changed only marginally and remain in a holding pattern at this writing. Most faculty are not actively resisting but the vote of no confidence in the president indicates their feelings in general, and on this issue, as clearly as could be.

Finally, turning to the last column (#6 of Diagram I) we see the desired Global/Functional Result of VI) long range Productivity and company effectiveness. Notice the result is long range and not short. American management has typically been rewarded with bonuses based on the previous one year's profits, while the Japanese reward with the previous three years' profits as a base. The Japanese system encourages planning for three years ahead and leads to more advance planning and resulting increase in long range productivity. Patchwork and ad hoc solutions and shooting from the hip are discouraged in Theory Z. In this vein, adjusting course offerings primarily on the basis of student demand in ignorance of long range curricular planning in a wholistic or humanistic manner is doomed to lower standards in the interests of short term market survival. This seems to be the direction of thrust of the imposed TSA division. Despite repeated but unsupported rhetoric about preserving the quality of education, the lack of evidence or precedent for such claimed preservation of quality leaves open the most likely conclusion that the president is preparing the groundwork for eliminating those programs, specialties or specialists that he deems suitable. The potential for abuse on internal political grounds is immense. And the incentive to faculty to push for collective bargaining is greatly enhanced by these tactics, at least for those who see through to what they feel is the basic, evidently oversimplified motivation of the president.

Recommendations

With this brief overview of Theory Z applied to a case of retrenchment in the university we have tried to illustrate how the outlines of a General Policy System Theory can be practically employed. But it remains to state some more practical suggestions to solve the dilemma of governance facing the university president and faculty described above. First of all, some research could be initiated on likely outcomes of the new policy, but only after the president states clearly and unambiguously precisely what he intends to accomplish. If it is simply a matter of making layoffs easier, there are alternatives to that, such as retraining or facilitating with released time or monetary incentives for teaching in departments or programs outside one's original appointment.

There could be bonuses given for 3 to 5 day workshops to consider alternate solutions to the management problem. Or time could be devoted to considering alternate careers or teaching specialties. A teaching specialty outside one's home department could be made mandatory, with teaching that course required at least every three years, but providing a ten per cent salary bonus based on the proportion of time or unit credit spent in teaching that outside course specialty. Any such system of incentives or required new specialties could be instituted on a three year trial basis. Incentives could also be made by granting released time for research purposes to [illegible] who exercise the requirement of teaching in a new specialty.

Another possibility to encourage collective cooperation would be to grant research monies partly on the basis of cooperative or joint research proposals. And as has often been called for, funding for administrative positions could be reduced and given to support the salaries of overworked teachers, especially since the number and salaries of administrators has in recent years outstripped those of teachers by a wide margin in the system of campuses under investigation.

On a more general level, consultation and presidential discretion ought to be guided by some of the following rules. First, Mortimer and McConnell borrow from Davis (p. 98; p. 283 in Mortimer and McConnell) to suggest that "The seven instruments that are most useful in the structuring of discretionary power are (1) open plans, (2) open policy statements, (3) open rules, (4) open findings, (5) open reasons, (6) open precedents, and (7) fair informal procedures.

In the consultation process it is important to know at the outset precisely which person or single designee will represent the president on a given issue. Mortimer and McConnell (pp. 275-280) indicate the need for 1) early consultation, 2) joint formulation of procedures, 3) time to formulate responses, 4) availability of information, 5) adequate feedback, and 6) communication of the decisions.

In a cynical view of tactics of presidential leadership, Cohen and March (1974: 207-214, stated in Mortimer & McConnell, pp. 169-170) listed the following guidelines: 1) Spend time. 2) Persist. 3) Exchange status for substance. 4) Facilitate opposition participation. 5) Overload the system. And 6) Manage unobtrusively. This is to a large extent what appears to have been done in the present case of dividing TSA's.

A more optimistic and ultimately more effective view would suggest the following guidelines for presidential leadership (from Mortimer & McConnell, pp. 170-171): 1) Stimulate a thorough analysis of the problems facing their institutions and encourage individuals and groups to offer possibly fruitful alternative solutions. 2) Emphasize institution-wide interests...; see that educational priorities...determine academic decisions. 3) Stimulate a high degree of lateral communication to break down departmental insulation and to enable inventive minds to find their counterparts in other sections of the institution. 4) Through face-to-face relationships, search for new ideas wherever they may be found, and help bring them to fruition. 5) Help innovators to find allies. 6) Propose means of improving the institution, suggest new programs, and attempt to adapt the organization to new purposes and activities.

As a final plea for the implementation of Theory Z, Ouchi (pp. 99f) indicates thirteen steps to reach it in practice. They are 1) Understand the Type Z Organization and your role. 2) Audit your company's philosophy. 3) Define the desired management philosophy and involve the company leader. 4) Implement the philosophy by creating both structures and incentives. 5) Develop interpersonal skills. 6) Test yourself and the system. 7) Involve the union. 8) Stabilize employment. 9) Decide on a system for slow evaluation and promotion. 10) Broaden career path development. 11) Preparing for implementation at the first level. 12) Seek out areas to implement participation. 13) Permit the development of wholistic relationships.

All of the preceding sets of guidelines could be located in diagrammatic form under column four on Procedures/Guidelines for implementation. The utility of this General Policy Systems Theory approach with its practical arm of the PTR (Purpose/Target/Results) format is such that it can rather easily provide insights and breadth of perspective that would never have been clearly indicated by just an ordinary search for solutions to management problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

McDougal, Myres S., and Harold D. Lasswell
1959 "The Identification and Appraisal of Diverse Systems of Public Order." The American Journal of International Law 53, 1-29.

Mortimer, Kenneth P., T.R. McConnell,
1978 Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nadler, Gerald
1980 "Relating Systems Concepts and Public Planning". Policy Sciences 12: 283-299.

National Education Association
1974 "Code of Ethics of the Education Profession". NEA Handbook 1974-75, pp. 224-226 Approved July 5, 1968, amended June 30, 1972. "Bill of Teacher Rights", p. 227-228.

Ouchi, William G.
1981 Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Author:
Carl Slawski
Sociology Department
California State University
Long Beach, CA 90840

Biography: Educated mainly in physics, classics, English literature, philosophy, psychology and sociology. Study of systems theory stimulated by courses under Walter Buckley and W. Ross Ashby. Ph.D. in Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1969.

DETAILED BIBLIOGRAPHY for "A General Policy Systems Approach to Organizational Governance", presented at the Society for General Systems Research meetings, Washington, D.C., January 8, 1982.

Albrecht, Karl, Ph.D.
1978 Successful Management by Objectives, An Action Manual, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall (Spectrum).

Allison, Graham T.
1971 Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown

American Association of University Professors
1975 "Termination of Faculty Appointments Because of Financial Exigency, Discontinuance of a Program or Department for Medical Reasons."
AAUP Bulletin 61, 4 (Dec 1975): 329-31.

Argyris, Chris
1964 Integrating the Individual and the Organization.
New York: Wiley.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schon
1978 Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective.
Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, Chris
1980 Inner Contradictions of Rigorous Research.
New York: Academic Press.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schon
1974 Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness.
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Armstrong, Forest H.
1980 Faulty Development Through Interdisciplinarity"
Journal of General Education 32, 1 (Spring).

Astin, Alexander W.
1976 Academic Gamesmanship: Student-Oriented Change in Higher Education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Astin, Alexander, and the Group for Human Development in Higher
1974 Education Faculty Development in a time of Retrenchment.
Change Magazine.

Baehler, James R ,
1980 The New Manager's Guide to Success, New York: Praeger.

Balderston, F. E.,
1974 Managing Today's University, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Baldridge, J. Victor (ed.)
1971 Academic Governance: Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Baldridge, J. Victor,
1980 "Managerial Innovation:- Rules for Successful Implementation",
Journal of Higher Education, 51, 2 (March-April) 117-134.

Baldridge, J. Victor, D. V. Curtis, George Ecker and Gary L. Riley,
1978 Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldridge, J V., T. Deal, and M. Ancell, eds.,
1975 Managing Change in Educational Organizations,
Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Baldridge, J. Victor, and Michael L. Tierney
1979 New Approaches to Management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, Warren
1973 The Leaning Ivory Tower. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, Warren
1976 The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead.
New York: Amacom.

Burns, James MacGregor
1978 Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Cartter, Allan M. (ed.)
1975 Assuring Academic Progress Without Growth. New Directions
for Institutional Research II, 2, (Summer).

Cavallo Roger E.,
1979 Systems Research Movement: Characteristics, Accomplishments,
and Current Developments,
General Systems Bulletin, Special Issue, (Summer) vol. IX, No. 3.

Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March
1974 Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.
New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen,
1972 "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choices"
Admin. Sci. Quarterly 17, 1 (March): 1-25.

Corwin, Ronald G.
1974 Education in Crisis. New York: Wiley.
Ch. 7, Strategies for educational reform.

Cowley, W.H.
1980 Presidents, Professor, and Trustees.
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Culbert Samuel A.
1974 The Organization Trap and How to Get Out of It.
New York: Basic Books.
de Mare, George,
1976 Corporate Lives, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Dill, David L.,
1971 Case Studies in University Governance,
Washington,D.C.: National Association of State Universities
and Land Grant Colleges.

Drucker, Peter F.
1980 Managing in Turbulent Times. New York: Harper & Row.

Eble, Kenneth E.
1978 The Art of Administration. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eurich, A. C.,
1970 "Plan or Perish," College and University Journal 9, 3: 18-22.

Foote, Caleb, Henry Mayer and Associates
1968 The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fordyce, Jack K., and Raymond Weil
1971 Managing with People: A Manager's Handbook of Organization Development Methods. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Frances, Carol
1980 "Apocalyptic vs. Strategic Planning." Change Magazine 12, 5, (July-August): 19 and 39-44.

French, Wendell L., and Cecil H. Bell, Jr.
1973 Organization Development. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Frost, Peter J.
1980 "Blind Spots in the Study of Organizations: Some Implications for Teaching and application," Group & Org. Studies 5, 2 (Jan.) 169-172.

Furniss, W. T.,
1974 "Retrenchment, Layoff and Termination," Educational Record 55, 31 (Summer) 159-70.

Gardner, John W.,
1965 "How to Prevent Organizational Dry Rot." Harper's Magazine 231 #1385: 20-26.

Gardner, John W.
1964 Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Perennial Library.

Gardner, John W.
1978 Morale. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

Glenny, Lyman A.,
1980 "Demographic and Related Issues for Higher Education in the 1980s," J. Higher Ed. 51, 4 (July-August): 363-380.

Glenny, Lyman A., John R. Shea, James H. Ruyle, Kathryn H. Fresch;
1976 Presidents Confront Reality, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Griffiths, Daniel E., and Donald J. McCarty (eds.)
1980 The Dilemma of the Deanship. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Grossman, Lee
1974 The Change Agent. New York: Amacom.

Hamellman, Paul W.
1972 Managing the University: A Systems Approach, New York: Praeger.

Heyns, Roger W., (ed.)
1977 Leadership for Higher Education: The Campus View. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Hodgkinson, H., J. Hurst, H. Levine, and S. Brent,
1974 A Manual for the Evaluation of Innovative Programs and Practices in Higher Education, Berkeley, CA: Ctr.for Res. & Dvt. in Higher Ed., Univ. of California.

Jay, Antony
1976 Managment and Machiavelli: An Inquiry into the Politics of Corporate Life. New York: Bantam Books.

Jedamus, Paul, Marvin W. Peterson, and Assoc.,
1980 Improving Academic Management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Jellema, W. W., ed.
1972 Efficient College Management, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Kanter, Rosabeth M.,
1977 Men and Women of the Corporation, New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, Rosabeth M., and Barry A. Stein,(eds.)
1979 Life in Organizations New York: Basic Books

Keast, William R., and Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher
1973 Education. Faculty Tenure. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kells, H.R.,
1980 Self-Study Processes: A Guide for Postsecondary Institutions, Washington, D.C. ACE.

Kemerer Frank R., and J. V. Baldridge,
1975 Unions on Campus: A National Study of the Consequences of Faculty Bargaining, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, Asa S., ed.,
1970 Handbook of College and University Administration, 2 vols., New York: McGraw Hill.

Kruytbosch, Carlos E. and Sheldon L. Messinger (ed.)
1970 The State of the University: Authority and Change. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lahti, Robert E.
1973 Innovative College Management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levinson, Daniel J. et al.
1978 The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine Books.

Lewis, Lionel
1975 Scaling the Ivory Tower: Merit and Its Limits in Academic Careers.
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Likert, Rensis, and J. G. Likert
1976 New Ways of Managing Conflict.
New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maier, R. H., and E. W. Weidner,
1975 "Creating and Encouraging an Innovative Academic Environment in Higher Education,"
Higher Education 4: 61-68.

Mann, A. J.,
1972 The Failure of Success,
New York: Amacom, Amer. Mgt. Assoc.

March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen
1979 Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations.
Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

Martorana S.V., and E. Kuhns,
1975 Managing Academic Change,
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mauer, George J. (ed.)
1976 Crisis in Campus Management: Case Studies in the Administration of Colleges and Universities.
New York: Praeger Publishers.

Mayhew, Lewis B. et al.
1974 Educational Leadership and Declining Enrollments.
Berkeley, CA McCutchan Publishing Corp.

McDougal, Myres S., and Harold D. Lasswell
1959 "The Identification and Appraisal of Diverse Systems of Public Order,"
The American Journal of International Law 53, 1-29.

McHenry, Dean E., and Associates
1977 Academic Departments. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McIntosh E., and P. Maier,
1976 "Management Skills in a Changing Academic Environment,"
Education Record (Spring) 87-91.

McManama John
1971 Systems Analysis for Effective School Administration.
West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co.

Miller, Delbert, and William H. Form
1964 Industrial Sociology: The Sociology of Work Organizations, second ed., New York; Harper and Row.

Miller, John P.
1976 Humanizing the Classroom: Models of Teaching in Affective Education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Millett, John D.,
1975 "Higher Education Management Versus Business Management," Educational Record 56 (Fall): 221-25.

Millett, John D.
1978 New Structures of Campus Power. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Millett, John D.
1980 Management, Governance and Leadership: A Guide for College and University Administrators. New York: Amacom.

Milton, Ohmer
1972 Alternatives to the Traditional: How Professor Teach and How Students Learn? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mortimer, Kenneth P., T. R. McConnell
1978 Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nadler, Gerald
1980 "Relating Systems Concepts and Public Planning." Policy Sciences 12: 283-299.

National Education Association
1974 "Code of Ethics of the Education Profession." NEA Handbook 1974-75, pp. 224-226. Approved July 5, 1968, amended June 30, 1972. "Bill of Teacher Rights," p. 227-228.

Newman, F., and Associates,
1971 Report on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., U. S. Dept. of H.E.W., Office of Education.

Nierenberg, Gerald I.
1973 Fundamentals of Negotiating. New York: Hawthorn Books.

Nierenberg, Gerald I.
1975 How to Give and Receive Advice. New York: Pocket Books.

Odiorne, G.
1972 "Up the Pyramid ...er Doughnut...er Beehive." National Business (Jan): 62-64.

Osipow, Samuel H.
1973 Theories of Career Development second ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:

Ouchi, William G.
1981 Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Perrow, Charles,
1978 "The Short and Glorious History of Organizational Theory," Ch. 32, pp. 313-323 in Jay M. Shafritz and Philip H. Whitbeck,
Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Co.

Pollay, R.W., R. N. Taylor, and M. Thompson,
1976 "A Model for Horizontal Power Sharing and Participation in University Decision Making."
J. of Higher Ed., 47 (March-April): 141-57.

Peter, Laurence J.
1972 The Peter Prescription. New York: Bantam Books.

Richman, Barry M.,
1974 Leadership, Goals and Power in Higher Education: A Contingency and Open-Systems Approach to Effective Management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sarasen, S. B.,
1972 The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seib, Kenneth A.,
1979 The Slow Death of Fresno State: A California Campus under Reagan and Brown. Palo Alto, CA: Ramparts Press.

Schon, Donald A.,
1971 Beyond the Stable State.
New York: Random House.

Scott, Robert A.
1978 Lords, Squires and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and Their Organizations, Washington: AAHE.

Shirley R.C., and M. H. Peters
1976 "University Merger: A Case of Organizational Change," College and University 51 (Winter): 142-52.

Sikes, Walter W , Lawrence E. Schlesinger, and Charles N. Seashore
1974 Renewing Higher Education from Within.
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simon, Herbert A.
1960 The New Science of Management Decision.
New York: Harper and Row.

Spencer R.C.,
1977 "A Vision of Quality."
CASE Currents. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, (Feb.): 4-6.

Stover, Webster S.,
1974 How To Become a College President.
New York: American Librarians' Agency.

Stern, G.,
1970 People in Context: Measuring Person-Environment Congruence in Education and Industry
New York: Wiley.

Tom Alan R.
1980 "The Reform of Teacher Education through Research: A Futile Quest,"
Teachers College Record 82, 1, (Fall): 15-29.

Touraine, Alaine,
1974 The Academic System in American Society.
New York: McGraw-Hill

Van den Berghe, Pierre
1970 Academic Gamesmanship. New York: Abelard-Schuman Limited.

Walker, Donald E.,
1979 The Effective Administrator: A Practical Approach to Problem Solving, Decision Making and Campus Leadership.
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weick Karl E.,
1980 "Blind Spots by Organizational Theorizing,"
Group and Organization Studies 5, 2, (June): 178-188.

Westerlund, Gunnar. & Sven-Erik Sjostrand,
1979 Organizational Myths
New York: Harper & Row.

Wilke, Arthur S. (ed.)
1979 The Hidden Professoriate: Credentialism, Professionalism, and the Tenure Crisis.
Westport Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Wilson. Logan,
1979 American Academics, Then and Now.
New York: Oxford University Press.

Zaltman Gerald, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski
1977 Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics, and Management. New York: Free Press.